

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/574,278
Amendment filed December 23, 2008
Reply to OA dated August 25, 2008

REMARKS

Claim 4 has been amended in order to more particularly point out, and distinctly claim the subject matter to which the applicants regard as their invention. Claims 2 and 3 have been canceled. The applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added. It is believed that this Amendment is fully responsive to the Office Action dated August 25, 2008. Entry of these amendments is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 2-4 were rejected under the second paragraph of 35 USC § 112 as being indefinite. Specifically, it was asserted that (a) the peak from 7.27-8.16 as recited in claims 2 and 3 for CMPB appeared to be inaccurate, and (b) the term “dissolving” used in claim 4 was also inaccurate. Reconsideration of this rejection in view of the above claim amendments and following comments is respectfully requested.

In response as to rejection (a), it is to be noted that claims 2-3 have been canceled herein. As to rejection (b), the suggestion contained in the Action has been adopted. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC § 112 is requested.

Further, it was indicated that (a) the “Taiwan Office Action” has been stricken from the IDS, (b) the reference AL has been stricken since a full copy of the patent has not been provided, and (c) two abstracts were provided for a reference and applicants should state which should be used.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/574,278
Amendment filed December 23, 2008
Reply to OA dated August 25, 2008

From a careful review, it would appear that the position is basically accurate with respect to (a). That is, the Office Action from Taiwan was not intended to be a reference, but was listed in an IDS to confirm that it has been considered. As to (b) and (c), applicants' further clarification is requested. Reference AL is not a patent and, according to applicants' records, a complete copy was provided. Further, there is no record of submitting two abstracts for a particular reference. In fact, there was apparently only one abstract submitted with the IDS.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims 1 and 4, as amended, are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the applicants undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. **10/574,278**
Amendment filed December 23, 2008
Reply to OA dated August 25, 2008

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, the applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

KRATZ, QUINTOS & HANSON, LLP



Donald W. Hanson
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 27,133

DWH/evb

Atty. Docket No. **060282**
Suite 400
1420 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

Enclosures: Petition for Extension of Time